

1  
2  
3  
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
5 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
6

7 SAMUEL DELGADILLO,

Case No. 1:25-cv-00642-KES-SKO

8 Plaintiff,

9 **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION**  
10 **TO DISMISS FOR FAILURE TO**  
11 **COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S**  
12 **ORDERS AND FAILURE TO**  
13 **PROSECUTE**

14 v.  
15 FRESNO POLICE DEPARTMENT,

16 (Docs. 4 & 5)

17 Defendant.

18 **TWENTY-ONE DAY DEADLINE**

19 Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed the complaint in this action on  
20 May 29, 2025. (Docs. 1, 2, & 3.)

21 On June 2, 2025, the Court issued an order finding that Plaintiff's complaint failed to state  
22 any cognizable claims and granting leave for Plaintiff to file an amended complaint within thirty  
23 days. (Doc. 4.) To date, Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or requested an extension of  
24 time within which to do so.

25 On July 10, 2025, an order issued for Plaintiff to show cause ("OSC") within twenty-one  
26 days why the action should not be dismissed for his failure to comply with the Court's screening  
27 order and for failure to prosecute this case. (Doc. 5.) Plaintiff was warned in the screening order  
28 and in the OSC that failure to comply with the Court's order would result in a recommendation to  
the presiding district judge of the dismissal of this action. (*Id.* at 2. *See also* Doc. 4 at 9.)  
Plaintiff has not yet filed any response, and the time to do so has passed.

29 The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide, "[f]ailure of counsel or  
30 of a party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the

1 Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” E.D. Cal. Local Rule  
2 110. *See also* E.D. Cal. Local Rule 183(a). “District courts have inherent power to control their  
3 dockets,” and in exercising that power, a court may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an  
4 action. *Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A  
5 court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action or  
6 failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g., Ferdik v. Bonzelet*,  
7 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring  
8 amendment of complaint); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)  
9 (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424  
10 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules).

11 Based on Plaintiff’s failure to comply with, or otherwise respond to, the screening order  
12 and the OSC, there is no alternative but to dismiss the action for his failure to obey court orders  
13 and failure to prosecute.

14 Accordingly, it is **HEREBY RECOMMENDED** that this action be dismissed for  
15 Plaintiff’s failure to obey court orders and failure to prosecute this action.

16 These Findings and Recommendation will be submitted to the United States District Judge  
17 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). **Within twenty-one**  
18 **(21) days** after being served with these Findings and Recommendation, Plaintiff may file written  
19 objections with the Court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s  
20 Findings and Recommendation.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the  
21 specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal. *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834,  
22 839 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

23 The Court DIRECTS the Clerk of Court to send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff at his  
24 address listed on the docket for this matter.

25  
26 IT IS SO ORDERED.

27 Dated: August 5, 2025

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto  
28 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE